## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

MARJORIE FERRELL, et al.,	)	
	Plaintiff, )	No. C-1-01-447 Hon. Sandra S. Beckwith
v.	į́.	
WYETH-AYERST LABORATORIES, INC. ) and AMERICAN HOME PRODUCTS CORP., )		
	Defendants.	

## PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STAY

The motion to stay filed by Marilyn Deyo should be denied. First, Ms. Deyo should not be permitted to intervene, for the reasons set forth in *Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Intervene*, filed herewith. Second, the motion to stay should be denied even if Ms. Deyo were permitted to intervene. As Plaintiffs explain in their opposition to the intervention motion, Ms. Deyo seeks to assert a legal argument under the Vermont Consumer Fraud Act that no court has ever accepted and that Judge Motz rejected in *In re Microsoft Corp. Antitrust Litig.*, 216 F. Supp. 2d 366 (D. Md. 2003). If Ms. Deyo wishes to pursue such a risky course on her own behalf, she may do so in her Vermont action. This action, however, should not be stayed while Ms. Deyo follows that course of action. This case is three years old. Plaintiffs have survived a motion to dismiss, and a class has been certified on a cause of action that is beneficial to Vermont endpayors. This case should not be set aside while Ms. Deyo, who did not file her complaint until last month, pursues her invalid legal theories. In short, Ms. Deyo has not given this Court the slightest basis "to justify abandoning the 'virtually unflagging obligation of the federal courts to exercise the jurisdiction given them." PaineWebber, Inc. v. Cohen, 276 F.3d 197, 209 (6th Cir. 2001) (quoting Colorado River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States, 424 U.S. 800, 817

PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STAY

(1976)). This Court can fully protect the interests of Vermont end-payors and should not defer to a recently-filed action that rests on an untenable legal theory already rejected by another district court.

Dated: January 20, 2005 Respectfully submitted,

\Craig R. Spiegel\
One of Plaintiffs' attorneys

Janet G. Abaray LOPEZ, HODES, RESTAINO, MILMAN, SKIKOS & POLOS 312 Walnut Street, Suite 2090 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Tel: (513) 852-5600 Joseph E. Conley, Jr. BUECHEL & CONLEY 25 Crestview Hills Mall Road Suite 104 Crestview Hills, Kty. 41017 Tel: (859) 578-6600

## Co-Liaison Counsel for End-Payor Plaintiffs

Kenneth A. Wexler Jennifer Fountain Connolly THE WEXLER FIRM LLP One North LaSalle, Suite 2000 Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 346-2222 Marc H. Edelson HOFFMAN & EDELSON 45 West Court Street Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901 (215) 230-8043

Alan I. Gilbert Barbara J. Felt Susan E. MacMenamin HEINS MILLS & OLSON, P.C. 3550 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612) 338-4605 Patrick E. Cafferty MILLER FAUCHER and CAFFERTY LLP 101 N. Main Street, Suite 450 Ann Arbor, MI 48104 (734) 769-2144

Steve W. Berman Craig Spiegel HAGENS BERMAN LLP 1301 5th Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101

## Co-Lead Counsel for End-Payor Plaintiffs